GILBERT HIGH 840 Main Street Gilbert, South Carolina 29054 9-12 High School GRADES 851 Students ENROLLMENT Paul R. Shealy 803-892-1100 PRINCIPAL SUPERINTENDENT Dr. Karen C. Woodward 803-951-8363 Ms. Kay P. Coker 803-892-3227 BOARD CHAIR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ANNUAL SCHOOL 2004 REPORT CARD ABSOLUTE RATING: EXCELLENT Absolute Ratings of High Schools with Students like Ours Excellent Average Below Average Unsatisfactory 20 5 0 0 0 IMPROVEMENT RATING: **EXCELLENT** ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS: YES This school met 13 out of 13 objectives. The objectives included performance and participation of students in various groups and student attendance rate. SOUTH CAROLINA PERFORMANCE GOAL By 2010, South Carolina's student achievement will be ranked in the top half of the states nationally. To achieve this goal, we must become one of the fastest improving systems in the country. FOR MORE INFORMATION, VISIT WEBSITES AT: WWW.MYSCSCHOOLS.COM

WWW.SCEOC.ORG

PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD

| | Absolute Rating | Improvement Rating | Adequate Yearly Progress |
|------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 2001 | Excellent | Good | N/A |
| 2002 | Excellent | Good | N/A |
| 2003 | Excellent | Good | No |
| 2004 | Excellent | Excellent | Yes |

DEFINITIONS OF DISTRICT RATING TERMS

- Excellent District performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Good District performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average District performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average District is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory District performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

HIGH SCHOOL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (HSAP) EXAM PASSAGE RATE: SECOND YEAR STUDENTS

| | | Our School | | High Schools with Students Like Ours | | | |
|--------------------|------|------------|------|---|------|------|--|
| Percent | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | |
| Passed 2 subtests | 84.4 | N/A | N/A | 82.2 | N/A | N/A | |
| Passed 1 subtest | 7.8 | N/A | N/A | 10.0 | N/A | N/A | |
| Passed no subtests | 7.8 | N/A | N/A | 8.5 | N/A | N/A | |

EXIT EXAM PASSAGE RATE BY SPRING 2004

| | Our School | High Schools with Students Like Ours |
|---------|------------|---|
| Percent | 99.4% | 97.2% |

ELIGIBILITY FOR LIFE SCHOLARSHIP

| Percent of | Our School | High Schools with Students Like Ours |
|---|------------|---|
| Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions* | 17.3 | 22.4 |
| Seniors who met the SAT/ACT requirement | 18.5 | 23.3 |
| Seniors who met the grade point average | 53.2 | 56.3 |

^{*}Using only the SAT/ACT and grade point average requirements

GRADUATION RATE

| | Our School | High Schools with Students Like Ours | | |
|--------------------|------------|---|--|--|
| Number of Students | 175 | 320 | | |
| Number of Diplomas | 149 | 261 | | |
| Rate | 85.1% | 82.7% | | |

| PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|------------------------|--|
| | Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2004 | | | Eligibility for LIFE Scholarship | | Graduation Rate | | |
| | | | n | % | n | % | Met State Objective | |
| All Students | 168 | 99.4 | 173 | 17.3 | 175 | 85.1 | YES | |
| Gender | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 83 | 100.0 | 86 | 11.6 | 90 | 83.3 | N/A | |
| Female | 85 | 98.8 | 87 | 23.0 | 85 | 87.1 | N/A | |
| Racial/Ethnic Group | | | | | | | | |
| White | 157 | 99.4 | 162 | 17.9 | 165 | 85.5 | N/A | |
| African-American | 8 | 100.0 | 9 | 11.1 | 9 | 88.9 | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | |
| Hispanic | 3 | I/S | 2 | I/S | 1 | I/S | N/A | |
| American Indian/Alaskan | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | |
| Racial/Ethnic Group | | | | | | | | |
| Non disabled | 153 | 100.0 | 155 | 18.7 | 153 | 87.6 | N/A | |
| Disabilities other than speech | 15 | 93.3 | 18 | 5.6 | 22 | 68.2 | N/A | |
| Migrant Status | | | | | | | | |
| Migrant | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A | |
| Non-migrant | 168 | 99.4 | 173 | 17.3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | |
| English Proficiency | | | | | | | | |
| Limited English Proficient | 2 | I/S | 0 | N/A | 1 | I/S | N/A | |
| Non-Limited English Proficient | 166 | 99.4 | 173 | 17.3 | 170 | 85.9 | N/A | |
| Socio-Economic Status | | | | | | | | |
| Subsidized meals | 36 | 100.0 | 33 | 3.0 | 36 | 66.7 | N/A | |
| Full-pay meals | 132 | 99.2 | 140 | 20.7 | 139 | 89.9 | N/A | |

| HSAP PERFORMANCE | BY GR | JUP | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------|------|--------|------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| | Enrollment 1st | % Tested | / `` | | / % | / | % Proficient and Advanced | Performance Objective | Participation |
| | isn/Langua | ge Arts - : | | | | | | | \/50 |
| All Students | 212 | 97.6 | 10.6 | 26.8 | 35.9 | 26.8 | 72.2 | YES | YES |
| Gender | | 400.0 | 44.0 | 05.0 | 044 | 00.7 | 74.4 | NI/A | NI/ |
| Male | 98 | 100.0 | 11.0 | 25.3 | 34.1 | 29.7 | 71.4 | N/A | N/ |
| Female | 114 | 95.6 | 10.3 | 28.0 | 37.4 | 24.3 | 72.9 | N/A | N/ |
| Racial/Ethnic Group | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 190 | 97.4 | 9.0 | 26.0 | 37.3 | 27.7 | 75.1 | YES | YE |
| African-American | 10 | 100.0 | 20.0 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 30.0 | I/S | I/ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 2 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/ |
| Hispanic | 9 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/ |
| American Indian/Alaskan | 1 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/ |
| Disability Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Disabled | 187 | 97.9 | 6.3 | 26.3 | 37.7 | 29.7 | 77.7 | N/A | N/ |
| Disabled | 25 | 96.0 | 43.5 | 30.4 | 21.7 | 4.3 | 30.4 | I/S | 1/ |
| Migrant Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Migrant | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/ |
| Non-Migrant | 212 | 97.6 | 10.6 | 26.8 | 35.9 | 26.8 | 72.2 | N/A | N/ |
| English Proficiency | | | | | | | | | |
| imited English Proficient | 3 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | 1/ |
| Non-Limited English Proficient | 209 | 97.6 | 9.7 | 27.2 | 35.9 | 27.2 | 72.8 | N/A | N/ |
| Socio-Economic Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Subsidized meals | 66 | 95.5 | 18.3 | 45.0 | 30.0 | 6.7 | 48.3 | YES | YE |
| Full-pay meals | 146 | 98.6 | 7.2 | 18.8 | 38.4 | 35.5 | 82.6 | N/A | N/ |
| | Mathemati | | • | | | | 02.0 | 1 | , |
| All Students | 212 | 97.6 | 11.6 | 28.3 | 37.9 | 22.2 | 69.7 | YES | YE |
| | 212 | 97.0 | 11.0 | 20.3 | 37.9 | 22.2 | 09.7 | IES | 1 - |
| Gender Male | 1 00 | 400.0 | 0.0 | 04.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 70.0 | NI/A | N. |
| | 98 | 100.0 | 8.8 | 24.2 | 36.3 | 30.8 | 76.9 | N/A | N/ |
| Female | 114 | 95.6 | 14.0 | 31.8 | 39.3 | 15.0 | 63.6 | N/A | N/ |
| Racial/Ethnic Group | 400 | 07.4 | 0.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 00.0 | 70.0 | \/E0 | |
| White | 190 | 97.4 | 9.6 | 28.2 | 39.0 | 23.2 | 72.9 | YES | YE |
| African-American | 10 | 100.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 40.0 | N/A | 40.0 | I/S | 1/ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 2 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | 1/ |
| Hispanic | 9 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | 1/ |
| American Indian/Alaskan | 1 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/ |
| Disability Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Not Disabled | 187 | 97.9 | 7.4 | 27.4 | 40.0 | 25.1 | 74.9 | N/A | N, |
| Disabled | 25 | 96.0 | 43.5 | 34.8 | 21.7 | N/A | 30.4 | I/S | I/ |
| Migrant Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Migrant | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/ |
| Non-Migrant | 212 | 97.6 | 11.6 | 28.3 | 37.9 | 22.2 | 69.7 | N/A | N/ |
| English Proficiency | | | | | | | | | |
| imited English Proficient | 3 | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/S | I/ |
| Non-Limited English Proficient | 209 | 97.6 | 10.8 | 28.7 | 37.9 | 22.6 | 70.3 | N/A | N/ |
| Socio-Economic Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Subsidized meals | 66 | 95.5 | 20.0 | 35.0 | 38.3 | 6.7 | 48.3 | YES | YE |
| Full-pay meals | 146 | 98.6 | 8.0 | 25.4 | 37.7 | 29.0 | 79.0 | N/A | N/ |
| an pay moulo | 1 170 | , 50.0 | , 0.0 | | , 01.1 | | , , , , , | 1 14//1 | 1 11/ |

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A Not Applicable N/AV Not Available N/C Not Collected N/R Not Reported I/S Insufficient Sample

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specifies that the statewide target is met for All Students and for the following subgroups: Racial/Ethnic, Subsidized Meals, Disability, and Limited English Proficiency.

| SCHOOL PROFILE | | | | |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | Our School | Change from Last Year | High Schools with Students Like Ours | Median High School |
| Students (n= 851) | | | | |
| Retention rate | 9.5% | Up from 6.6% | 7.7% | 9.1% |
| Attendance rate | 95.7% | Up from 95.4% | 95.9% | 96.0% |
| Eligible for gifted and talented | 11.8% | Up from 9.7% | 11.0% | 5.8% |
| With disabilities other than speech | 11.5% | Up from 10.6% | 11.1% | 12.7% |
| Older than usual for grade Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses | 8.9% 3.1% | Up from 7.1% Up from 2.1% | 7.3% 3.0% | 9.8% 1.6% |
| Enrolled in AP/IB programs | 8.2% | Up from 8.1% | 17.2% | 10.2% |
| Successful on AP/IB exams | 72.2% | | 63.8% | 53.8% |
| Annual dropout rate | 1.0% | Down from 2.3% | 2.3% | 2.7% |
| Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations | 11.8% | Up from 11.1% | 3.5% | 3.6% |
| Enrollment in career/technology center courses | 597 | Up from 518 | 769 | 466 |
| Students participating in worked-based experiences | 7.5% | Down from 9.4% | 22.4% | 25.7% |
| Career/technology students mastering core competencies | 86.1% | Up from 85.1% | 79.0% | 77.7% |
| Career/technology completers placed | 95.7% | Down from 98.3% | 100.0% | 99.3% |
| Teachers (n= 58) | | | | |
| Teachers with advanced degrees | 67.2% | Up from 62.1% | 59.4% | 52.0% |
| Continuing contract teachers | 93.1% | Up from 89.7% | 86.7% | 82.1% |
| Highly qualified teachers** | 97.8% 1.8% | N/A | 89.5% 6.0% | 89.5% 8.6% |
| Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates | | | | |
| Teachers returning from previous year | 88.8% | Down from 89.4% | 89.0% | 86.2% |
| Teacher attendance rate Average teacher salary | 96.3% \$42,695 | Up from 95.5% Up 3.7% | 95.9% \$41,751 | 95.3% \$41,060 |
| Prof. development days/teacher | 9.4 days | Up from 7.3 days | 10.3 days | 10.6 days |
| School | | ο ρ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | ,. |
| Principal's years at school | 5.0 | Up from 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Student-teacher ratio in core subjects | 25.1 to 1 | Down from 25.6 to 1 | 27.8 to 1 | 26.4 to 1 |
| Prime instructional time | 90.6% | Up from 90.0% | 90.7% | 90.0% |
| Dollars spent per pupil* | \$7,930 | Up 11.5% | \$5,945 | \$6,310 |
| Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* | 54.9% | Down from 61.1% | 58.3% | 57.9% |
| Opportunities in the arts | Excellent | No change | Excellent | Excellent |
| Parents attending conferences SACS accreditation | 86.0% Yes | Up from 82.5% No change | 88.3% Yes | 89.3% Yes |
| Character development program | Below Average | N/A | Good | Good |
| * Prior year audited financial data are reported. | | Our District | St | ate |
| Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** | | 94 2% | 92 | 0% |

Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools**

Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools**

N/A

State Objective

Highly qualified teachers in this school**

65.0%

Yes

Student attendance in this school

95.3%

Yes

**NOTE: The verification process was not completed for the year reported; therefore the count of highly qualified teachers may not be accurate.

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A Not Applicable N/AV Not Available N/C Not Collected N/R Not Reported I/S Insufficient Sample

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

Dear Parent/Guardian:

This year our staff and students implemented many initiatives designed to make Gilbert High School better. We believe that we can continue to improve instruction for our students. After all, these students are preparing to work in the technical businesses of the 21st century.

Throughout all subject areas we implemented an exemplary writing program designed to help students improve their written communication skills. Teaching staff used curriculum calibration in an effort to align subject content to the appropriate grade level.

We reviewed the overall friendliness and climate of the school.

For the first time teachers were able to use results from the Measures of Academic Progress or MAP tests to plan instruction. Several teachers piloted new instructional delivery systems by using SMART Boards (interactive whiteboards that turn computers and projectors into powerful teaching tools).

The Fine Arts and Occupational Departments brought recognition to GHS with outstanding performances at state level competitions. The band marched their way to a second place finish in the AA State Marching Contest. The chorus participated in a national music festival competition in Orlando, Florida, and received the distinguished honor of the Sweepstakes Award for the most outstanding choral program as well as three first place awards and a second place award. Agricultural students placed first in the state in cattle judging, second in poultry judging and fourth in horticulture. Health Science students captured eight first place awards at their state competition.

Gilbert students earned academic honors, too. Students who qualified for the A/B honor roll were treated to free donuts on two occasions at school and with a banquet at the end of the year. Seven students were named Palmetto Fellows. One student was selected as a commended National Merit Semi-finalist. All seniors who earned credits to graduate in May of 2004 passed all parts of the Exit Exam.

Low student attendance continues to challenge Gilbert High School. We plan to address this concern by offering students rewards for good attendance and by communicating regularly with parents.

Too many students' reading scores are not at the proper grade level and this contributes to academic difficulties. In the coming year we plan to use instructional strategies in the classroom to identify students' reading weaknesses and to improve all students' overall reading ability.

Paul R. Shealy, Principal

Mary Sims, Chair, SIC

| EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Teachers | Students* | Parents* | | | | |
| Number of surveys returned | 45 | 109 | 4 | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with learning environment | 88.6% | 76.1% | I/S | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with social and physical environment | 91.1% | 78.9% | I/S | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with home-school relations | 80.0% | 79.8% | I/S | | | | |
| *Only playanth grade students and their parents were included. For schools with | out grade 11 only | the highest grade | was included | | | | |